arXiv:hep-ph/9909361v1 14 Sep 1999

DISSIPATIVE EFFECTS IN SEMILEPTONIC B-$\overline{\mathrm{B}}$ DECAYS

F. Benatti
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy
and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste

R. Floreanini
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

We study the time evolution and decay of the neutral B-meson system using quantum dynamical semigroups. New, nonstandard terms appear in the expression of relevant observables; they can be parametrized in terms of six phenomenological constants. Although very small, these parameters may be detected in the new generation of dedicated B-meson experiments.

Dynamics that extend the time evolution predicted by ordinary quantum mechanics have been studied in various physical phenomena. Typical examples are the open quantum systems, represented as small subsystems in interaction with large environments. Although the total system is closed and its time evolution is standard and unitary, the dynamics of the subsystem, obtained by eliminating the environment degrees of freedom, develops dissipation and irreversibility.

Assuming the interaction between subsystem and environment to be "weak", a condition met in most physical situations, the sub-dynamics can be given a precise mathematical description in terms of the so-called quantum dynamical semigroups. These are entropy-increasing, linear maps that transform density matrices into density matrices (*i.e.* state into states), with forward in time composition law (semigroup property), that satisfy the condition of complete positivity.[1-3]

This description is very general; although developed in the framework of quantum optics,[4-6] it has been successfully applied to model a large variety of different physical situations. In particular, quantum dynamical semigroups have been used in the study of unstable systems.[7-9] It is therefore natural to look for signals of induced dissipative effects in the dynamics and decay of elementary particles. Indeed, general considerations based on quantum gravity effects [10-15] and the dynamics of extended objects [16, 17] suggests that completely positive time evolutions can be expected in the description of many particle physics phenomena, as the result of the interaction with a "stringy" environment.

In this respect, particularly suitable for the analysis of dissipative, non-standard phenomena are neutron interferometers[11, 18] and systems of neutral mesons.[19-24] Detailed study of the K^0-$\overline{K^0}$ system using quantum dynamical semigroups has been performed, in the case of both single and correlated kaons;[21-24] the outcome of these investigations is that the dissipative contribution in the extended dynamics could be in the reach of the next generation of kaon experiments.

In the following, we shall devote our attention to the B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ system and analyze its time-evolution using a similar approach. Dedicated B-meson experiments are now collecting data, so that it appears timely to discuss possible signals of dissipative effects in the observables these experiments will measure.

We shall study semileptonic decays of both single and correlated neutral B-mesons and show that certain combinations of observables directly accessible to the experiment are particularly sensitive to the dissipative effects, quite independently from the values of the other standard CP and CPT violating phenomenological parameters.[†] Although more complete studies, that include precise analysis of acceptance and efficiency of the various detectors, are certainly necessary, our investigation suggests that future B-meson experiments should be able to put stringent limits on the parameters that describe non-standard, dissipative phenomena.

As in the case of the K^0-$\overline{K^0}$ system, the evolution and decay of the neutral B-meson system can be effectively modelled by means of a two-dimensional Hilbert space. (We shall limit our discussion to the B_d-mesons, although most discussions below apply to the

---

[†] For recent studies on possible violations of the CPT symmetry in B-decays, see [25-28] and references therein.

B_s-mesons as well.) The states of this system will be described by a density matrix ρ. In the basis $|B^0\rangle$, $|\overline{B^0}\rangle$, it can be written as:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & \rho_3 \\ \rho_4 & \rho_2 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\rho_4 \equiv \rho_3^*$, and $*$ signifies complex conjugation.

The evolution in time of this matrix can be described quite in general by an equation of the following form:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -iH\,\rho(t) + i\rho(t)\,H^\dagger + L[\rho]. \tag{2}$$

The first two pieces in the r.h.s. give the standard hamiltonian contribution, while L is a linear map that encodes possible dissipative, non-standard effects.

The effective hamiltonian H includes a non-hermitian part, $H = M - \frac{i}{2}\mathit{\Gamma}$, that characterizes the natural width of the states. The entries of H can be expressed in terms of its eigenvalues: $\lambda_S = m_S - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_S$, $\lambda_L = m_L - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_L$, and the two complex parameters ϵ_S, ϵ_L, appearing in the corresponding eigenstates,

$$|B_S\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\,(1+|\epsilon_S|^2)}} \begin{pmatrix} 1+\epsilon_S \\ 1-\epsilon_S \end{pmatrix} \ , \quad |B_L\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\,(1+|\epsilon_L|^2)}} \begin{pmatrix} 1+\epsilon_L \\ -1+\epsilon_L \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{3}$$

We use here a notation that follows the conventions adopted for the neutral kaon system.[25] The two states in (3) are expected to have a negligible width difference,

$$\Delta\Gamma \ll \Gamma \ , \qquad \Delta\Gamma = \gamma_S - \gamma_L \ , \qquad \Gamma = \frac{\gamma_S + \gamma_L}{2} \ , \tag{4}$$

so that they are more conveniently distinguished via their mass difference, $\Delta m = m_L - m_S$, rather than their different lifetimes. The notation $|B_L\rangle$, for the light meson, and $|B_H\rangle$, for the heavy partner are therefore sometimes used instead of those in (3).

The form of the additional piece $L[\rho]$ in (2) is fixed by the physical requirements that the complete time-evolution, $\gamma_t : \rho(0) \mapsto \rho(t)$, needs to satisfy. Generally, the one parameter (=time) family of linear maps γ_t should transform density matrices into density matrices and have the properties of increasing the entropy, of obeying the semigroup composition law, $\gamma_t[\rho(t')] = \rho(t+t')$, for $t,\ t' \geq 0$, of preserving the positivity of $\rho(t)$ for all times. Actually, for the physical consistency of the formalism, in the case of correlated systems, one has to demand that the time evolution γ_t be completely positive.[24]

With these requirements, the linear map $L[\rho]$ can be parametrized in terms of six real constants. To write it down explicitly, one expands the density matrix ρ in terms of Pauli matrices σ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and the unit matrix σ_0: $\rho = \rho_\mu\,\sigma_\mu$, $\mu =$ 0, 1, 2, 3; then, the map L can be represented by a symmetric 4×4 matrix $\big[L_{\mu\nu}\big]$, acting on the vector with components $(\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3)$. Explicitly one finds:[21]

$$\big[L_{\mu\nu}\big] = -2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b & c \\ 0 & b & \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & c & \beta & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{5}$$

with a, α and γ non-negative. The parameters a, b, c, α, β, and γ are not all independent; to assure the complete positivity of the time-evolution generated by (2), they have to satisfy certain inequalities (for details, see [21, 23]).

Physical observables of the neutral B-meson system can be obtained from the density matrix $\rho(t)$ obeying (2) by taking its trace with suitable hermitian operators. In order to study the time evolution of these observables, one has to solve the equation (2) for an arbitrary initial state $\rho(0)$.

Rough dimensional estimates based on phenomenological considerations predict the non-standard parameters to be very small, at most of order $m_B^2/M_P \approx 10^{-18}$ GeV, where m_B is the B-meson mass and M_P is Planck's mass.[19-21] The piece $L[\rho]$ in (2) can then be treated as a perturbation. Furthermore, to simplify the computations, we shall work in a phase convention for the states $|B^0\rangle$, $|\overline{B^0}\rangle$ such that the CP violation induced by the effective hamiltonian H is small, of order 10^{-3} (in practice, this amounts assuming $\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L)$ to be of the same order of magnitude). As a consequence, possible T and CPT violating effects in H are also small.[25, 27] With this phase choice, the quantities $\epsilon_S\Delta\Gamma$ and $\epsilon_L\Delta\Gamma$ turn out to be roughly of the same order of magnitude of the non-standard parameters a, b, c, α, β, and γ. The use of perturbation theory in all these quantities is therefore justified.

It should be noticed that the above phase choice differs from the phase convention usually adopted in the Standard Model for the study of the B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ system (which implies a sizable imaginary part for the combination $\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L$). In the present work, we focus our attention on the dissipative part $L[\rho]$ of the evolution equation (2), parametrized as in (5) in terms of a, b, c, α, β, and γ. Since the map L is linear, these parameters, being small in one phase convention, remain small in any other phase choice. Therefore, for our purposes, the rather unusual phase convention adopted in the following† does not affect in any way the generality of our discussion.

As mentioned in the introductory remarks, we shall limit our analysis to the study of semileptonic decays $h\ell\nu$ of the neutral B-meson system, where h stands for any allowed charged hadronic state. We shall be as general as possible, and include in our discussion possible violations of the $\Delta B=\Delta Q$ rule. The amplitudes for the decay of a B^0 or $\overline{B^0}$ state into $h^-\ell^+\nu$ and $h^+\ell^-\bar\nu$ can then be parametrized in terms of three complex constants, x_h, y_h and z_h, as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}(B^0\rightarrow h^-\ell^+\nu)=\mathcal{M}_h(1-y_h)\ , \tag{6a}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\overline{B^0}\rightarrow h^+\ell^-\bar\nu)=\mathcal{M}_h^*(1+y_h^*)\ , \tag{6b}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(B^0\rightarrow h^+\ell^-\bar\nu)=z_h\,\mathcal{A}(\overline{B^0}\rightarrow h^+\ell^-\bar\nu)\ , \tag{6c}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\overline{B^0}\rightarrow h^-\ell^+\nu)=x_h\,\mathcal{A}(B^0\rightarrow h^-\ell^+\nu)\ , \tag{6d}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_h$ is a common factor. (Sometimes,[31] $\bar x_h\equiv z_h^*$ is used instead of z_h.) The $\Delta B=\Delta Q$ rule requires $x_h=z_h=0$, while CPT-invariance, $y_h=0$.

---

† Note that precisely this phase convention has been used to present some measured data by the OPAL Collaboration [29, 30].

The hermitian operators that describe these semileptonic decays can be easily obtained from (6); explicitly, in the $|B^0\rangle$, $|\overline{B^0}\rangle$ basis, one gets:

$$\mathcal{O}_{h^-} = \frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^2}{2}\, |1-y_h|^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_h \\ x_h^* & |x_h|^2 \end{bmatrix}\ , \qquad \mathcal{O}_{h^+} = \frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^2}{2}\, |1+y_h|^2 \begin{bmatrix} |z_h|^2 & z_h^* \\ z_h & 1 \end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{7}$$

The quantities x_h, y_h and z_h are expected to be very small; therefore, in the following we shall treat them as the other small parameters in the theory. In the computation of semileptonic observables below, we shall keep only first order terms in all these parameters; this approximation turns out to be more than adequate for our considerations.

We shall first study observables connected to the time-evolution and decay of a single, uncorrelated B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ system, that can be typically measured at colliders. Let us indicate with $\rho_{B^0}(t)$, $\rho_{\bar{B}^0}(t)$ the time evolution according to (2) of a state that is initially a pure B^0, $\overline{B^0}$ meson, described by the density matrices:

$$\rho_{B^0} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\ , \qquad \rho_{\bar{B}^0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{8}$$

The probability rate that an initial ρ_{B^0}, $\rho_{\bar{B}^0}$ state decays at time t into a given semileptonic state $h\ell\nu$ described by one of the operators in (7) is then given by:

$$\mathcal{P}_h(B^0;t) = \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{B^0}(t)\, \mathcal{O}_h\big]\ , \qquad \mathcal{P}_h(\overline{B^0};t) = \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{\bar{B}^0}(t)\, \mathcal{O}_h\big]\ . \tag{9}$$

In writing down the explicit form of the probabilities $\mathcal{P}$, it is convenient to introduce the new variable $\tau = t\,\Gamma$; in practice, τ expresses the time variable in units of the B lifetime. It is also customary to define the two combinations:[†]

$$\omega = \frac{\Delta m}{\Gamma}\ , \qquad \delta = \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2\Gamma}\ . \tag{10}$$

Although not directly measured, δ is expected to be very small, $\delta \leq 10^{-2}$, while the most recent data give: $\omega = 0.734 \pm 0.035$.[32] In discussing B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ observables, one often takes the simplified assumption $\delta = 0$; in the following, we shall keep δ nonvanishing, unless explicitly stated.

Up to first order in all small parameters, the probabilities (9), apart from an overall exponential decay, have oscillatory behaviour modulated by ω and exponential behaviour dictated by δ:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(B^0;\tau) = \frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^2}{2} e^{-\tau}\Big\{ &\cos\omega\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L) - 2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h) - e^{-(A-D)\tau}\Big] \\ &+ \sin\omega\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{I}m(z_h) + \frac{4\,\delta}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{I}m(C) - \mathcal{R}e(B)\Big]\end{aligned}$$

[†] They are usually called x_B and y_B, respectively; we do not use these labels to avoid confusion with the parameters introduced in (6).

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\cosh\delta\tau\Big[1-2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L)+2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)\Big]\\
&-\sinh\delta\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{R}e(z_h)-\frac{D}{\delta}+\frac{4\,\omega}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{I}m(C)\Big]\Big\}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{11a}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(B^0;\tau)=\frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^2}{2}e^{-\tau}\Big\{&-\cos\omega\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)-e^{-(A-D)\tau}+\frac{4\,\delta}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{R}e(C)\Big]\\
&-\sin\omega\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_S-\epsilon_L)+2\,\mathcal{I}m(x_h)-\mathcal{R}e(B)\Big]\\
&+\cosh\delta\tau\Big[1-2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)+\frac{4\,\delta}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{R}e(C)\Big]\\
&-\sinh\delta\tau\Big[2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S-\epsilon_L)+2\,\mathcal{R}e(x_h)-\frac{D}{\delta}\Big]\Big\}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{11b}
$$

where the convenient shorthand notations have been used:

$$
A=\frac{a+\alpha}{\Gamma}\ ,\quad B=\frac{\alpha-a+2ib}{\Delta m}\ ,\quad C=\frac{c+i\beta}{\Gamma}\ ,\quad D=\frac{\gamma}{\Gamma}\ ;
\tag{12}
$$

the expressions for $\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(\overline{B^0};\tau)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(\overline{B^0};\tau)$ are obtained from (11b) and (11a) by changing the sign of ϵ_S, ϵ_L, y_h, C and exchanging x_h and z_h.

The decay rates $\mathcal{P}$ can be observed at colliders; in particular, the analysis reported in Ref.[29] for the standard case can surely be repeated with the extended expressions above. Nevertheless, it is more convenient to construct specific asymmetries by taking suitable combinations of the $\mathcal{P}$'s. Two independent asymmetries that can then be constructed are:

$$
A_T(\tau)=\frac{\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(\overline{B^0};\tau)-\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(B^0;\tau)}{\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(\overline{B^0};\tau)+\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(B^0;\tau)}\ ,
\tag{13a}
$$

$$
A_{CPT}(\tau)=\frac{\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(\overline{B^0};\tau)-\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(B^0;\tau)}{\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(\overline{B^0};\tau)+\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(B^0;\tau)}\ .
\tag{13b}
$$

The first one signals the violation of time reversal by measuring the rate difference between the process $B^0\to\overline{B^0}$ and its time-conjugate $\overline{B^0}\to B^0$, while the second asymmetry is sensitive to CPT violating effects, by comparing the rate difference between the process $B^0\to B^0$ and its CPT-conjugate $\overline{B^0}\to\overline{B^0}$. Using the expressions for the probabilities $\mathcal{P}$ given before, one explicitly finds (for τ not too small, in the case of the first asymmetry):

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_T(\tau)=2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L)+2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)&\\
+\frac{1}{\cosh\delta\tau-\cos\omega\tau}&\bigg[\sin\omega\tau\bigg(\mathcal{I}m(x_h-z_h)-\frac{4\,\delta}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{I}m(C)\bigg)\\
+\sinh\delta\tau&\bigg(\mathcal{R}e(z_h-x_h)+\frac{4\,\omega}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\mathcal{I}m(C)\bigg)\bigg]\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{14a}
$$

$$
A_{CPT}(\tau)=2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)-\frac{4\,\delta}{\delta^2+\omega^2}\left(\frac{\cosh\delta\tau-\cos\omega\tau}{\cosh\delta\tau+\cos\omega\tau}\right)\mathcal{R}e(C)
$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\cosh\delta\tau + \cos\omega\tau}\left[\sin\omega\tau\left(2\,\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_S - \epsilon_L) + \mathcal{I}m(x_h - z_h)\right)\right.$$
$$\left. + \sinh\delta\tau\left(2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S - \epsilon_L) + \mathcal{R}e(x_h - z_h)\right)\right] . \qquad (14b)$$

Other independent asymmetries can be constructed with the semileptonic decay rates $\mathcal{P}$; they all involve the non-standard parameter C besides ϵ_S, ϵ_L, x_h, y_h, z_h. Therefore, by fitting the experimental data with the explicit expression of all these asymmetries one should be able to extract estimates for C. Unfortunately, as apparent from (14), C is always accompanied by a factor δ, so that its dependence is further suppressed with respect to the other small parameters. In particular, the approximation $\delta \approx 0$ would completely eliminate the presence of this parameter from (14). The asymmetries A_T and A_{CPT} (and analogue ones) are therefore not suitable for identifying dissipative effects; instead, they can be used to obtain estimates on some combinations of the conventional CP and CPT violating parameters also in presence of dissipative phenomena.

Nevertheless, one can construct more complicated combinations of the semileptonic probability rates $\mathcal{P}$, which are particularly sensitive to the non-standard parameters. One illuminating example is given by:

$$A_{\Delta m}(\tau) = \frac{\left[\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(B^0;\tau) - \mathcal{P}_{h^-}(\overline{B^0};\tau)\right] - \left[\mathcal{P}_{h^+}(B^0;\tau) - \mathcal{P}_{h^+}(\overline{B^0};\tau)\right]}{\mathcal{P}_{h^-}(B^0;\tau) + \mathcal{P}_{h^-}(\overline{B^0};\tau) + \mathcal{P}_{h^+}(B^0;\tau) + \mathcal{P}_{h^+}(\overline{B^0};\tau)} \ . \qquad (15)$$

In the approximation $\delta \approx 0$, it assumes a very simple form:

$$A_{\Delta m}(\tau) = e^{-A\tau}\,\cos\omega\tau + \sin\omega\tau\left[\mathcal{R}e(B) - \mathcal{I}m(x_h + z_h)\right] . \qquad (16)$$

Thanks to the different time-behaviour, a measure of $A_{\Delta m}$ allows, at least in principle, a determination of the parameter A and of the combination $\mathcal{R}e(B) - \mathcal{I}m(x_h + z_h)$; assuming the validity of the $\Delta B = \Delta Q$ rule, via the definitions in (12), one can then obtain an estimate of the two dissipative parameters a and α. The actual accuracy of such a determination highly depends on the sensitivity of the measure of $A_{\Delta m}$. Although a specific discussion on this point is surely beyond the scope of the present work, simulations presented in [25] in the case of similar observables suggest that the accuracy on the measure of (15) at present colliders can be estimated in about ten percent; this sensitivity is already enough to give interesting bounds on a and α. However, future dedicated B-experiments can greatly improve these estimates.

Other useful asymmetries can be obtained by considering time-integrated rates:

$$\mathcal{P}_h(B) = \frac{1}{\Gamma}\int_0^\infty d\tau\ \mathcal{P}_h(B;\tau) \ . \qquad (17)$$

Using again a combination analogous to the one in (15), one gets, in the same approximation:

$$A'_{\Delta m} = \frac{1}{1+\omega^2}\left\{1 - \omega\,\mathcal{I}m(x_h + z_h) + \omega\,\mathcal{R}e(B) + \frac{1}{1+\omega^2}\left[(\omega^2 - 1)A - 2\,\omega^2 D\right]\right\} . \qquad (18)$$

Assuming again the $\Delta B = \Delta Q$ rule, a measure of $A'_{\Delta m}\,(1+\omega^2)$ not compatible with 1 would clearly signal the presence of non-standard effects; this is surely the most simple check on the extended dynamics given by (2) that can be performed at colliders, using semileptonic decays.

Further insights on the dissipative phenomena described by the non-standard time evolution generated by (2) can be obtained from experiments at the so-called B-factories; indeed, correlated B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ systems look particularly suitable for studying phenomena involving loss of quantum coherence. In those set-ups, correlated B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ mesons are produced from the decay of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. Since the Υ-meson has spin 1, its decay into two spinless bosons produces an antisymmetric spatial state. In the Υ rest frame, the two neutral B-mesons are produced flying apart with opposite momenta; in the basis $|B^0\rangle$, $|\overline{B^0}\rangle$, the resulting state can be described by:

$$|\psi_A\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(|B^0,-p\rangle\otimes|\overline{B^0},p\rangle - |\overline{B^0},-p\rangle\otimes|B^0,p\rangle\Big)\ . \tag{19}$$

The corresponding density operator ρ_A is a 4×4 matrix that can be conveniently written in terms of single kaon projectors:

$$P_1 \equiv |B^0\rangle\langle B^0| = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\ ,\qquad P_2 \equiv |\overline{B^0}\rangle\langle\overline{B^0}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{20a}$$

and the off-diagonal operators

$$P_3 \equiv |B^0\rangle\langle\overline{B^0}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\ ,\qquad P_4 \equiv |\overline{B^0}\rangle\langle B^0| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\ . \tag{20b}$$

Explicitly, one finds:

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{2}\Big[P_1\otimes P_2\ +\ P_2\otimes P_1\ -\ P_3\otimes P_4\ -\ P_4\otimes P_3\Big]\ . \tag{21}$$

The time evolution of a system of two correlated neutral B-mesons, initially described by ρ_A, can be analyzed using the single B-meson dynamics previously discussed. In studying the time evolution of ρ_A, we shall assume that, once produced in a Υ decay, the kaons evolve in time each according to the completely positive map γ_t generated by (2). This assures the positivity of the eigenvalues of any physical states at all times.[24]

Within this framework, the density matrix that describes a situation in which the first B-meson has evolved up to proper time t_1 and the second up to proper time t_2 is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A(t_1,t_2) &\equiv \big(\gamma_{t_1}\otimes\gamma_{t_2}\big)\big[\rho_A\big]\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\Big[P_1(t_1)\otimes P_2(t_2)\ +\ P_2(t_1)\otimes P_1(t_2)\ - P_3(t_1)\otimes P_4(t_2) - P_4(t_1)\otimes P_3(t_2)\Big]\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $P_i(t_1)$ and $P_i(t_2)$, $i=1,2,3,4$, represent the evolution according to (2) of the initial operators (20), up to the time t_1 and t_2, respectively.

The typical observables that can be studied with correlated mesons systems are double decay rates, *i.e.* the probabilities $\mathcal{G}(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2)$ that a meson decays into a final state f_1 at proper time t_1, while the other meson decays into the final state f_2 at proper time t_2. They can be computed using:

$$\mathcal{G}(f_1, t_1; f_2, t_2) = \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(\mathcal{O}_{f_1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{f_2}\Big)\rho_A(t_1, t_2)\Big] \ , \tag{23}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{f_1}$, $\mathcal{O}_{f_2}$ represent 2×2 hermitian matrices describing the decay of a single meson into the final states f_1, f_2, respectively. For the purpose of the present note, that deals with semileptonic decays, they can be identified with one of the matrices in (7).

Unfortunately, the B-mesons decay too quickly to allow in general a precise enough measure of the double decay rates in (23). Therefore, much of the analysis at B-factories is carried out using integrated distributions at fixed time interval $t = t_1 - t_2$. One then deals with single-time distributions, defined by

$$\mathit{\Gamma}(f_1, f_2; t) = \int_0^\infty dt'\, \mathcal{G}(f_1, t' + t; f_2, t') \ , \tag{24}$$

where t is taken to be positive. For negative t, one defines:

$$\mathit{\Gamma}(f_1, f_2; -|t|) = \int_0^\infty dt'\, \mathcal{G}(f_1, t' - |t|; f_2, t')\ \theta(t' - |t|) \ ; \tag{25}$$

the presence of the step-function is necessary since the evolution is of semigroup type, with forward in time propagation, starting from zero (we can not propagate a kaon before it is created in a Υ-decay). In this case, one easily finds: $\mathit{\Gamma}(f_1, f_2; -|t|) = \mathit{\Gamma}(f_2, f_1; |t|)$. In the following, we shall always assume: $t \geq 0$.

The dynamics generated by (2) gives results for the double probabilities $\mathit{\Gamma}(f_2, f_1; t)$ that substantially differ from the ones obtained using ordinary quantum mechanics. The most striking difference arises when the final states coincide $f_1 = f_2 = f$ and t becomes small. Due to the antisymmetry of the initial state ρ_A in (21), quantum mechanics predicts a vanishing value for $\mathit{\Gamma}(f, f; 0)$, while in general this is not the case for the completely positive dynamics generated by (2). The quantities $\mathit{\Gamma}(f, f; 0)$ are therefore very sensitive to the dissipative parameters a, b, c, α, β and γ.

Indeed, in the case of semileptonic final states, neglecting higher order terms in δ multiplying small parameters, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathit{\Gamma}(h^\pm, h^\pm; 0) =& \frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^4}{8\Gamma}\bigg\{A - \frac{\omega}{1+\omega^2}\Big[\mathcal{R}e(B) - \omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B)\Big] \\ &\qquad\qquad \pm \frac{8\delta}{(4+\omega^2)^2}\Big[(4-\omega^2)\,\mathcal{R}e(C) + 4\,\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(C)\Big]\bigg\} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

It turns out that also the remaining two semileptonic probabilities at $t = 0$ depend only on the non-standard parameters:

$$\mathit{\Gamma}(h^\pm, h^\mp; 0) = \frac{|\mathcal{M}_h|^4}{8\Gamma}\bigg\{2(1+D) - A + \frac{\omega}{1+\omega^2}\Big[\mathcal{R}e(B) - \omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B)\Big]\bigg\} \ . \tag{27}$$

More in general, one can study the explicit time-dependence of various semileptonic asymmetries that can be constructed out of the integrated probabilities (24). Using again the variable $\tau = t\,\Gamma$, the analogous of the asymmetry (13a),

$$\mathcal{A}_T(\tau) = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^-;\tau) - \mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^+;\tau)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^-;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^+;\tau)}\ , \tag{28}$$

takes the following explicit expression (up to first order in δ and for τ not too large):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_T(\tau) =& \frac{2}{1+\cos\omega\tau}\bigg\{ \big[\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S+\epsilon_L) - 2\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h)\big](1-\cos\omega\tau)\\ &+\frac{2\delta}{(4+\omega^2)^2}\Big[\big[(\omega^2-4)\,\mathcal{R}e(C) - 4\,\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(C)\big](1+\cos\omega\tau)\\ &-\frac{4}{\omega^2}\big[(4+3\omega^2)\,\mathcal{I}m(C) - \omega^3\,\mathcal{R}e(C)\big]\sin\omega\tau - \frac{2(4+\omega^2)}{\omega}\big[\omega\,\mathcal{R}e(C) - 2\,\mathcal{I}m(C)\big]\tau\Big]\bigg\}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Here again one notices the suppression of the C-dependence by a factor δ with respect to the other small parameters: it is therefore difficult to extract informations about C by fitting (29) with the experimental data. However, as τ becomes small, the expression for $\mathcal{A}_T$ simplifies; in particular, as already noted, the dependence on ϵ_S, ϵ_L and y_h disappear:

$$\mathcal{A}_T(0) = \frac{4\,\delta}{(4+\omega^2)^2}\Big[(\omega^2-4)\,\mathcal{R}e(C) - 4\,\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(C)\Big]\ . \tag{30}$$

A non-vanishing measure of $\mathcal{A}_T(0)$ would therefore provide evidence for C.

Similarly, in the case of the combination

$$\mathcal{B}(\tau) = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^+;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^-;\tau)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^+;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^-;\tau)}\ , \tag{31}$$

one finds, neglecting terms proportional to δ times C in the denominator,

$$\mathcal{B}(0) = \frac{\Lambda}{1+D}\ , \tag{32}$$

where

$$\Lambda = A + \frac{\omega}{1+\omega^2}\big[\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B) - \mathcal{R}e(B)\big]\ . \tag{33}$$

This combination of non-standard parameters appears also in the study of the asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta m}(\tau)$, analogous to the one in (15) for single-meson systems:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta m}(\tau) = \frac{\big[\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^+;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^-;\tau)\big] - \big[\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^-;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^+;\tau)\big]}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^+;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^-;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^+,h^-;\tau) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-,h^+;\tau)}\ . \tag{34}$$

It takes a very simple form (we neglect terms containing δ times small parameters):

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta m}(\tau) = \Big[A(1+\tau) + \mathcal{I}m(B) - 1\Big]\cos\omega\tau + \frac{\mathcal{R}e\big[B(i-\omega)e^{i\omega\tau}\big]}{1+\omega^2}\ , \tag{35}$$

so that,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta m}(0) = \Lambda - 1 \ . \tag{36}$$

Once the combination Λ is measured via (36), one can deduce the value of D from (32) and a measure of $\mathcal{B}(0)$. Further, by fitting experimental data with (35), from the different time behaviours one can extract A and the combination $\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B) - \mathcal{R}e(B)$.

The asymmetry in (34) will be accurately measured at the B-factories, since it is used to obtain a precise determination of the mass difference Δm.[33, 34] An independent analysis of the form (35) of $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta m}$ is certainly needed in order to estimate precisely the sensitivity of those experiments to the dissipative parameters A and the combination $\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B) - \mathcal{R}e(B)$. However, from the discussion in [33] and the simulations presented in [27], in which a simplified version of the extended dynamics (2), (5) is used, one can reasonably expect that the actual measured data will at the end constrain the dissipative terms, as well as the standard CP and CPT violating parameters, to a few percent level. This would allow to establish significant limits on the presence of dissipative effects in the B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ system.

Time-independent probabilities can further be obtained by integrating the rates $\mathit{\Gamma}$:

$$\mathit{\Gamma}(f_1, f_2) = \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_0^\infty d\tau\ \mathit{\Gamma}(f_1, f_2; \tau) \ ; \tag{37}$$

this procedure gives the full rate for the double B-meson decay into the final states f_1 and f_2. Out of these quantities, one can form total dileptonic asymmetries:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\ell\ell} = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-) - \mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-)} \ , \qquad \mathcal{A}'_{\ell\ell} = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^-) - \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^+)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-)} \ . \tag{38}$$

Unfortunately, these quantities, that are measured at B-factories, are not sensitive to the non-standard parameters, because of the suppression by factors δ. For example, one has (to first order in δ):

$$\mathcal{A}_{\ell\ell} = 2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S + \epsilon_L) - 4\,\mathcal{R}e(y_h) - \frac{4\delta}{\omega^2}\,\mathcal{R}e(C) \ . \tag{39}$$

Instead, the asymmetries (38) can be used with confidence to constrain standard CP and CPT violating effects, even in presence of dissipative phenomena.[33, 34]

More useful observables for identifying the presence of the extra, non-standard parameters are the total B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ mixing probability:

$$\chi_B = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^-) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^+)} \ , \tag{40}$$

and the ratio of the total, same-sign to opposite-sign semileptonic rates:

$$R_B = \frac{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^+) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^-)}{\mathit{\Gamma}(h^+, h^-) + \mathit{\Gamma}(h^-, h^+)} \ . \tag{41}$$

They can both be expressed in terms of the following combination of dissipative, non-standard parameters:

$$X = A + \omega^2\, D + \omega\big[\omega\,\mathcal{I}m(B) - \mathcal{R}e(B)\big]\ ; \tag{42}$$

in fact, one explicitly finds:

$$\chi_B = \frac{\omega^2}{2(1+\omega^2)}\left[1 + \frac{2}{\omega^2(1+\omega^2)}\, X\right]\ , \qquad R_B = \frac{\omega^2}{2+\omega^2}\left[1 + \frac{4}{\omega^2(2+\omega^2)}\, X\right]\ . \tag{43}$$

It should be stressed that while the dependence of χ_B and R_B on the standard CP and CPT violating parameters is at most quadratic,[26] the extra parameters responsible for possible dissipative extensions of quantum mechanics appear linearly in (43), via the combination (42). Therefore, these two observables are particularly suitable for checking the presence of a non-vanishing value for the combination X. Their measure provide two separate estimates for this quantity; instead, in ordinary quantum mechanics $X = 0$, thus χ_B and R_B are not independent.

Unfortunately, so far both quantities in (43) have not been measured with great accuracy; χ_B is the better determined parameter and the most recent data give: $\chi_B = 0.156 \pm 0.024$.[32] Using this value and the already quoted one for ω, from (43) one gets the result: $X = (-4.5 \pm 6.3) \times 10^{-2}$. In order to obtain estimates for the non-standard parameters in (5), one needs measurements of other independent quantities besides X, involving not only semileptonic final decay states. However, when $a = 0$,[18] the form (5) of the extra piece in the equation (2) simplifies, since complete positivity implies: $\alpha = \gamma$ and $b = c = \beta = 0$. In such a case, the previous result for X gives a direct estimate of the surviving parameter α. Assimilating $1/\Gamma$ to the B^0 lifetime, one finally gets: $\alpha = (-3.5 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-14}$ GeV. The accuracy on the determination of X will be greatly improved by the measurements at the B-factories. Indeed, preliminary estimates of about one percent sensitivity to R_B have been reported to be attainable in [27], while a conservative estimate of two percent accuracy in the measure of χ_B is indicated in [28]. If confirmed by the actual data, these sensitivities will allow a determination of the combination X with about ten percent accuracy.

In conclusion, we have examined possible signals of the presence of dissipative, non-standard dynamics in the evolution of the B^0-$\overline{B^0}$ system. Various observables involving semileptonic decays have been identified as being particularly sensitive to the dissipative effects; these observables will be measured with great accuracy in the new generation of dedicated B-experiments (BaBar, Belle, CLEO-III, LHC-b). These new measurements, besides being crucial for the confirmation of the standard model theory of CP violation, could very well provide clear evidence for phenomena that go beyond ordinary quantum mechanics.

REFERENCES

1. R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lect. Notes Phys. **286**, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987)
2. V. Gorini, A. Frigerio, M. Verri, A. Kossakowski and E.C.G. Surdarshan, Rep. Math. Phys. **13** (1978) 149
3. H. Spohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1980) 569
4. W.H. Louisell, *Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation*, (Wiley, New York, 1973)
5. C.W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, Berlin, 1992)
6. M.O. Scully and M.S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997)
7. L. Fonda, G.C. Ghirardi and A. Rimini, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41** (1978) 587
8. H. Nakazato, M. Namiki and S. Pascazio, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B10** (1996) 247
9. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 149
10. S. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1983) 395; Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 904; Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3099; S. Hawking and C. Hunter, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 044025
11. J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos and M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B241** (1984) 381;
12. S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 867
13. S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 854
14. M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B410** (1993) 143
15. L.J. Garay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 2508; Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 124015
16. J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B293** (1992) 37; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11** (1996) 1489
17. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Ann. of Phys. **273** (1999) 58
18. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B451** (1999) 422
19. J. Ellis, J.L. Lopez, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3846
20. P. Huet and M.E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. **B434** (1995) 3
21. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Nucl. Phys. **B488** (1997) 335
22. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B401** (1997) 337
23. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Nucl. Phys. **B511** (1998) 550
24. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A12** (1997) 1465; Banach Center Publications, **43** (1998) 71; Comment on "Searching for evolutions of pure states into mixed states in the two-state system K-$\overline{K}$", `hep-ph/9806450`
25. V.A. Kostelecký and R. Van Kooten, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5585
26. P. Colangelo and G. Corcella, Eur. Phys. J. C **1** (1998) 515
27. S. Yang and G. Isidori, Test of CPT invariance in semileptonic B decays, BaBar Note #438, 1998

28. A. Mohapatra, M. Satpathy, K. Abe and Y. Sakai, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 036003
29. The OPAL Collaboration, Zeit. fur Physik **C76** (1997) 401
30. The OPAL Collaboration, CERN-EP/98-195, Eur. Phys. J. C (1999)
31. N.W. Tanner and R.H. Dalitz, Ann. of Phys. **171** (1986) 463
32. Particle Data Group, Eur. Phys. J. C **3** (1998) 1
33. G. De Domenico and Ch. Yèche, Dilepton analysis in BaBar experiment: measurement of the mixing parameter Δm_B and study of the T (CP) violation purely in mixing, BaBar Note #409, 1998
34. The BaBar Collaboration, *The BaBar Physics Book*, SLAC-R-504, 1998, Ch. 11